



**Citizen Design Work Group Meeting  
Wednesday, May 27, 2009  
Meeting Results**

**Cache Co. Administration Bldg.**  
Multipurpose Room #109 – 10 a.m. to noon

**Purpose of the meeting:** to collaboratively determine recommendations for the design elements to be included in the buffer areas of the cross section alternatives through the residential area; from the curb to the edge of right of way line.

**I. Attendance**

- Citizens / Community representatives
  - Paul Duree – corridor resident (for Martha Arndt)
  - Jeff Gilbert, Cache Co. MPO
  - Jay Monson, Logan City Council
  - Mark Nielsen, Logan City Public Works Director
  - Angie Pritchett-Tremayne – corridor resident
  - Troy Thurston, Logan City Police
  - Alan Hinckley, Woodruff Neighborhood Council Rep.
  - Koley Rollins, Woodruff School PTA
- Design Team
  - Charles Mace, UDOT Project Mgr.
  - Kyle Comer, Civil Science Project Mgr.
  - Mike Pepper, KMP Planning

**II. Introduction and Background**

- Recent background: Mike and Kyle gave a brief overview of the activities that have occurred since the project restarted in March 2009. In particular they highlighted that due to public input and request for a wider section that would accommodate wider buffer/pedestrian area through the residential area, and UDOT's desire to obtain a typical section width, UDOT had directed the design team to consider and gather input on wider cross sections for the area between 200 South and 1000 South.
- Alternative alignments and cross sections: the design team developed a series of alignments and wider cross sections for the residential area (200 South to 1000 South) for consideration and discussion with adjacent property owners.
  - Alternatives included the following:
    - Narrow cross section – as shown at last public mtg (with minor changes)
    - 110 ft. typical cross section for an east, west and centerline alignment, plus a western transition immediately south of 600 South
    - 124 ft. typical cross section – west alignment only
    - 124 ft. typical cross section with frontage road – west alignment only

- Details provided for each alternative included:
  - Right of way widths and locations
  - Cross section drawings that illustrated the location and width of travel and turn lanes, shoulder, curb and gutter, buffer and sidewalk spaces
  - Current setback requirements for front, back, side and corner facing properties
  - Number and designation of affected properties and structures likely to be acquired for each alignment option
  - Number of likely affected eligible historic properties for each alignment option
  - Amount of wetlands likely affected for each alignment option
- Residential area property owners workshops: all residents with property bordering 10<sup>th</sup> West between 1000 South and 200 South were invited to a meeting on Tuesday, May 26<sup>th</sup> to review the alternatives and provide input
  - Comment forms were provided to gather input regarding preferences for each alignment and cross section – see the 10<sup>th</sup> West project web site “10<sup>th</sup> West Residential Property Owner Section Meeting Results” for details
- Accident data overview
  - Troy Thurston provided an overview of the accident occurrences on 10<sup>th</sup> West from 1991 through 2008. Accident data illustrated that overall; there are very few pedestrian and injury accidents on 10<sup>th</sup> West.

### III. Citizen Design Group Alignment / Cross Section Input

- Group consensus for alignment and cross section: Following presentation of each of the alternative alignments and cross sections, the Design Group unanimously voiced support for the 124 ft. cross section with frontage road, to be implemented with a west alignment as shown.
- General cross section and alignment comments:
  - Be sure to conduct a thorough evaluation of the benefits of the frontage road to weigh against the cost and reduced remaining funds for development of other areas of the corridor
  - Evaluate opportunities for effective use of the remaining parcels or portions of land that would be acquired, but not used for roadway/frontage road, buffer or landscaping areas
  - Implement traffic calming measures were feasible
  - The frontage road would provide benefits in access control, improved traffic flow from west side neighborhood areas to 10<sup>th</sup> West (via 600 South and 200 South) safety improvement, moves pedestrians farther from 10<sup>th</sup> West, allows for additional landscaping and aesthetic improvements, etc.
  - Discussed installation of pedestrian refuge areas in roadway median near 3 Pt. Ave, but dismissed due to safety concerns
  - General agreement that if a pedestrian crossing at 3 Pt. Ave. does not meet warrants for a crossing, that crossing at this location be discouraged and pedestrians routed north or south along the frontage road to crossings at either 600 South or 200 South
  - Provide for irrigation system infrastructure and operation needs
  - Consistent interest in including a fence to separate pedestrians from 10<sup>th</sup> West

- Consider water source for irrigation of landscaped areas; nearby artesian well may be a potential source
- The City of Logan is willing to:
  - Be responsible for maintenance of the landscaped buffer areas, along 10<sup>th</sup> West and the proposed frontage road
  - Provide snow removal from the sidewalks, providing the sidewalks are a minimum of 6 ft. wide
  - Assume ownership and maintenance of the frontage road, which would be constructed by UDOT as part of the project.
- General buffer area design comments
  - Include a fence where feasible to separate pedestrians from the roadway
  - Any landscaping should be low/easy maintenance

#### IV. Specific Cross Section Buffer Area Design Recommendations

- The group reached consensus agreement for the following design elements for the buffer areas.
  - 110 ft. cross section – basic features
    - 6 ft. landscaped buffer space between curb and sidewalk
    - 6 ft. concrete sidewalk (this is a minimum to allow for city snow removal)
  - 124 ft. cross section – basic features
    - 7.5 ft. landscaped buffer space between curb and sidewalk
    - Minimum 8 ft. concrete sidewalk – consider 10 ft. where feasible for bicycle/shared use
    - Fencing - Preference for property fences between property and sidewalk. Fencing could also be installed between sidewalk and roadway, if acceptable within UDOT design standards
  - 110 and 124 ft. cross sections - landscaping
    - Buffer space to be landscaped with street-scale trees on 30 ft. centers (that meet City and UDOT requirements) and grass, for ease of maintenance. Remember to consider water conservation needs when planning landscaping.
  - 110 and 124 ft. cross sections – decorative lighting
    - Buffer area to include decorative street lights, placed on approx. 200 ft. centers (in addition to cobra head light fixtures that may be installed at intersections). City will pay the difference between the cost of cobra heads only and the addition of decorative street lights. Also consider application of “dark sky” requirements when selecting and placing street lights.
  - 124 ft. cross section with frontage road
    - Buffer area between the frontage road and properties (right of way edge)
      - Minimum 10 ft. landscaped buffer space between curb and sidewalk (along frontage road) – includes grass and street-scale trees only
      - Minimum 6 ft. concrete sidewalk
    - Buffer area between 10<sup>th</sup> West and frontage road – variable width
      - Landscaping – miscellaneous landscaping, including street-scale trees, grass, etc.
      - Decorative lighting – same as for 110 and 124 ft. cross sections

▪ Fencing

- Discussion: Several options for fencing to separate pedestrians from 10<sup>th</sup> West were discussed. City representatives noted that if a fence were constructed between 10<sup>th</sup> West and the frontage road, maintenance between the fence and the property line would be the responsibility of the property owners, which has not proven very successful previously. If only property fences were allowed at the property line, the city would assume maintenance of all space between the 10<sup>th</sup> West curb and the property lines west of the frontage road.
- **Suggested fencing solution by the design team (following the meeting):** due to the distance from the frontage road sidewalk and 10<sup>th</sup> West, a fence is not likely needed as a safety feature. However, if a fence is desired, it should be constructed between the frontage road and the frontage road sidewalk. This leaves the frontage road and buffer area between the frontage road and 10<sup>th</sup> West as open landscaped space that would be maintained by the city.

- Narrow section – no recommendations due to no support for this option